	Case 3:07-cv-03543-JCS Doc	cument 1	Filed 07/09/2007	Page 1 of 15	
1 2 3 4	GAIL C. TRABISH, ESQ. (#10348 BOORNAZIAN, JENSEN & GART A Professional Corporation 555 12 th Street, Suite 1800 P. O. Box 12925 Oakland, CA 94604-2925 Telephone: (510) 834-4350 Facsimile: (510) 839-1897		SOR FRE	OT JUL S PM 1: 05	, g
567	Attorneys for Defendant TARGET STORES, a division of Target Corporation				
8	UNITI	ED STATES	DISTRICT COURT		
9	NORTHI	ERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNL	A JCS	
10	ROBERTA STANTON	j	Cse No 7	3549	
11 12	Plaintiff,)	[San Mateo County No.: CIV 461266])
13	vs.))	PETITION FOR	REMOVAL OF	
14	TARGET CORPORATION, and DO 10, inclusive,) DES 1 to)		ANT TO 28 U.S.C.	
15 16	Defendants.)	Complaint Filed: N	March 2, 2007	
17	TO THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE	ENTITLED	COURT:		
18	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE	that Defend	lant TARGET STOF	RES, a division of Targ	get
19 20	Corporation (hereinafter "Target"),				
21	below.		.*		
22		I. JUR	ISDICTION		
23	1. Defendant TARGET	is informed	and believes that pla	aintiff Roberta Stanton is	a
24	citizen of the State of California, and				
25	for Removal.		, and the second	•	
26 27	2. Defendant TARGET i	is a Minnesc	ota corporation, whose	principal place of busine	SS
28	is in Roseville, Minnesota.				
		_	-1-		
	PETITION FOR REMOVAL	OF ACTION	– [San Mateo County Case	No. CIV 461266]	
11					

///

- 3. TARGET is a publicly held corporation whose Chairman and Chief Executive Officer is Bob Ulrich.
 - 4. Defendant TARGET is not a citizen of the state in which this action is pending.
- 5. The matter in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000, exclusive of interest, attorney's fees and costs.
 - 6. The Court has jurisdiction by virtue of 28 U.S.C. §1332 and 28 U.S.C. §1441(b).

II. GROUNDS FOR REMOVAL

- 7. On March 2, 2005, a civil action was commenced in the San Mateo County Superior Court, Unlimited Jurisdiction, of the State of California, entitled *Roberta Stanton v. Target Corporation, et al.*, Action No. CIV 461266. A true and correct copy of the summons and complaint is attached hereto and marked as **Exhibit A.**
- 8. Defendant TARGET was served with a copy of said Complaint on March 23, 2007.

 A true and correct copy of the Proof of Service is attached hereto and marked as **Exhibit B**.
- 9. Defendant TARGET has answered plaintiff's complaint. A true and correct copy of the answer is attached hereto and marked as **Exhibit C.**
- 10. This Court has original jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332, and the complaint is one which may be removed to this Court by Defendant TARGET pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §1441(b) in that it is a civil action between citizens of different states, and the amount in controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.
- 11. Defendant TARGET is the only named defendant in this action, and it is informed and believes that no other defendants have been served in this action.

	Case 3:07-cv-03543-JCS	Document 1	Filed 07/09/2007	Page 3 of 15
1	Based on the foregoin	g, Defendant TA	ARGET respectfully re	quests that this Court accept
2	removal of this action.			
3	DATED 1-1-9 2007		DOODNIA ZIANI IEN	CENT & CADTHE
4	DATED: July		BOORNAZIAN, JEN A Professional Corpo	
5			11.	
6			By: Mul	TDADICII ECO
7			Attorney	TRABISH, ESQ.
8				ORES, a division of t Corporation
9	24901\409072			
10				
11				
12	·			•
13 14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26	·			
27				·
28	÷		-3-	
	PETITION FOR REM	MOVAL OF ACTIO	N – [San Mateo County Ca	se No. CIV 461266]

Document 1

Filed 07/09/2007

FOR COURT USE ONLY ISOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE

SUK MUS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO):

Target Corporation, Does 1 to 10, inclusive

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTA DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE) : Roberta Stanton

ENDORSED FILED SAN MATEO COUNTY

> MAR 2 2007

Clerk of the Superior Court M. dayillener **BEPUTY GLERK**

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response, You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association.

Tiene 30 DIAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presenta su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/espanol/) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales,

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es): San Mateo County Courts 400 County Center, 2nd Floor Redwood City, CA 94063 CASE NUMBER (Número del Caso):

Unlimited Civil

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiff's attorney, or plaintiff without an attorney, is:

(El nombre, la dirección y el número de teléfono del abogado del demandante, o del demandante que no tiene abogado, es):

Wavne R. Wolski, Esq.

(707) 542-4519

713 Spring Street Santa Rosa, CA 95404

DATE:

MAR

2 2007

JOHN C. FITTON

Clerk, by

M. JAVILLONAF

Deputy (Adjunto)

(Secretario) (For proof of service of this summons, use Proof of Service of Summons (form POS-010).)

(Para prueba de entrega de esta citatión use el formulario Proof of Service of Summons, (POS-010)).

[SEAL]

NOTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED: You are served as an individual defendant.

as the person sued under the fictitious name of (specify):

3. On behalf of (specify):

CCP 416.10 (corporation)

CCP 416.20 (defunct corporation) CCP 416.40 (association or partnership)

other (specify): by personal delivery on (date): CCP 416.60 (minor)

CCP 416.70 (conservatee) CCP 416.90 (authorized person)

Page 1 of 1

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judiciał Council of Celifornia SUM-100 [Rev. January 1, 2004] Martin Dean's Essential Forms TM

SUMMONS

Code of Civil Procedure §§ 412.20, 465



Case 3:07-cv-03543-JCS Document 1 Filed 0	7/09/2007 Page 5 of 15PLD-PI-001
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, Stall number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY
Wayne R. Wolski, Esq. SBN# 118600	·
Law Offices of Wayne R. Wolski	
713 Spring Street	
Santa Rosa, CA 95404	
YELEPHONE NO: (707) 542-4519 FAX NO. (Optional): (707) 542-7139	
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Oplional):	
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff Roberta Stanton	ENDORSED FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF San Mateo	ENDORSEDLIFT
STREET ADDRESS: 400 County Center, 2nd Floor	SAN MATEO COUNTY
MAILING ADDRESS:	
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Redwood City, CA 94063	MAR 2 2007
BRANCH NAME: Unlimited Civil	a mediae Court
PLAINTIFF: Roberta Stanton	Clerk of the Superior Court
	By M. Javillonar DEPUTY CLERK
DEFENDANT: Target Corporation	DEPOT TOLLAN
DOES 1 TO 10, inclusive	
COMPLAINT-Personal Injury, Property Damage, Wrongful Death	
AMENDED (Number):	
Type (check all that apply):	
MOTOR VEHICLE OTHER (specify): Negligence, Premises Liability	
Property Damage Wrongful Death	
Personal Injury Other Damages (specify):]
I P. C. Calanda M. Mara anni A.	0.05.1(1)10.55
Jurisdiction (check all that apply): ACTION IS A LIMITED CIVIL CASE	CASE NUMBER:
Amount demanded does not exceed \$10,000	
exceeds \$10,000, but does not exceed \$25,000	CIV 4 6 1 2 6 6
ACTION IS AN UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE (exceeds \$25,000)	
ACTION IS RECLASSIFIED by this amended complaint	
from limited to unlimited	
from unlimited to limited	
1. Plaintiff (name or names): Roberta Stanton	
alleges causes of action against defendant (name or names): Target Corporation	Does 1 to 10
inclusive	1, 2003 1 to 10,
 This pleading, including attachments and exhibits, consists of the following number of particular controls. 	anes.
Each plaintiff named above is a competent adult	
a. except plaintiff (name):	
(1) a corporation qualified to do business in California	
(2) an unincorporated entity (describe):	
(3) a public entity (describe):	
(4) a minor an adult	
(a) for whom a guardian or conservator of the estate or a guardian	ad litem has been appointed
(b) other (specify):	
(5) other (specify):	
·	
b. except plaintiff (name):	
(1) a corporation qualified to do business in California	
(2) an unincorporated entity (describe):	
(3) a public entity (describe):	
(4) a minor an adult	
(a) for whom a guardian or conservator of the estate or a guardian	ad litem has been appointed
(b) other (specify):	
(5) other (specify):	
Information about additional plaintiffs who are not competent adults is shown in Attachme	ent 3
Enformed and a control of planting three are not competent additions of shown in Attachmen	Page 1 of 3

	Case 3:07-cv-03543	-JCS Docume	ent 1 Filed (07/09/2007	Page 6 of 15 LD-PI-001
,	SHORT TITLE: Stanton v. Target	·		5 NUMBER:	
	4. Plaintiff (name):				
	is doing business under the fictitious	name (specify):			
	and has complied with the fictitious b 5. Each defendant named above is a name				
	 a. except defendant (name): Target Corporation 	n	c. except d	efendant (name) :	
	(1) a business organiz	ation, form unknown			ization, form unknown
	(2) a corporation (3) an unincorporated	entity (describe) :	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	a corporation an unincorporated	d entity (describe):
	(4) a public entity (des	cribe) :	(4)	a public entity (de	scribe) :
	(5) other (specify):		(5)	other (specify):	
	b. accept defendant (name):		d. 🔲 except de	fendant (name):	
	(1) a business organiza	ition, form unknown	(1) 🔲 8	business organiz	ation, form unknown
	(2) a corporation	124		corporation	antity (danariba):
	(3) an unincorporated e	muty (aescribe) :	(3)	in unincorporated	entity (describe):
	(4) a public entity (desc	ribe) :	(4) 🔲 a	public entity (des	cribe) :
	(5) a other (specify):		(5) 🔲 o	ther (specify):	
6	Information about additional defendants. The true names of defendants sued as Doe a. Doe defendants (specify Doe nunamed defendants and acted with b. Doe defendants (specify Doe nuplaintiff. Defendants who are joined under Code	es are unknown to plain mbers): 1-10 thin the scope of that a mbers): 1-10	ntiffwerd gency or employmen are	e the agents or en t. persons whose ca	nployees of other spacities are unknown to
8	 This court is the proper court because a. at least one defendant now resides b. the principal place of business of a c. injury to person or damage to person d. other (specify): 	defendant corporation	or unincorporated as		urisdictional area.
9.	Plaintiff is required to comply with a cla a. has complied with applicable claims b. is excused from complying because	statutes, or			

SHORT TITLE: Stanton v. Target	E NUMBER:
10. The following causes of action are attached and the statements above apply to each (e causes of action attached): a. Motor Vehicle b. General Negligence c. Intentional Tort d. Products Liability e. Premises Liability f. Other (specify):	ach complaint must have one or more
a. ✓ wage loss b. ☐ loss of use of property c. ✓ hospital and medical expenses d. ✓ general damage e. ☐ property damage f. ✓ loss of earning capacity g. ☐ other damage (specify):	
 12. The damages claimed for wrongful death and the relationships of plaintiff to the deca. a. listed in Attachment 12. b. as follows: 	ceased are
13. The relief sought in this complaint is within the jurisdiction of this court.	
 14. Plaintiff prays for judgment for costs of suit; for such relief as is fair, just, and equitable; a. (1) ✓ compensatory damages (2) ☐ punitive damages The amount of damages is (in cases for personal injury or wrongful death, you must (1) ✓ according to proof (2) ☐ in the amount of: \$ 	
15. The paragraphs of this complaint alleged on information and belief are as follows (sp	pecify paragraph numbers):
Date: February 28, 2007	
Wayne R. Wolski, Esq. (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) (SIGNATION	URE OF PLAINTIFF OR ATTORNEY)

:	Case 3:07-cv-03543-JCS	Document 1	Filed 07/09/2007	Page 8 of 1250-Pi-001
SHORT	TITLE:		'E NUMBE	R:
Stanto	on v. Target	·		
_	FIRST CAUSE	OF ACTION-	General Negligence	Page 4
ΓA	TTACHMENT TO 🗹 Complaint 🔲 Cros	ss-Complaint		
(U	lse a separate cause of action form for each o	cause of action.)		
G1	N-1. Plaintiff (name): Roberta Stanton			
	alleges that defendant (name): Target	Corporation		

▼ Does	1	to 10	
---------------	---	-------	--

was the legal (proximate) cause of damages to plaintiff. By the following acts or omissions to act, defendant negligently caused the damage to plaintiff

on (date): April 20, 2005

at (place): Redwood City, San Mateo County, California

(description of reasons for liability):

On or about April 20, 2005, in Redwood City, San Mateo County, California, Plaintiff was acting reasonably and foreseeably in performing her customary duties assembling display furniture on behalf of her employer, National Marketing Services, at a Target retail store owned, maintained, operated and controlled by Defendants and each of them. The incident happened at approximately 11:00 p.m. At that time and place, Defendants and each of them had a duty to keep the premises safe and in a new defective condition for persons on the premises. Instead Defendants and each of non-defective condition for persons on the premises. Instead, Defendants and each of them carelessly and negligently spilled and/or failed to clean up a slippery substance, perhaps a cleaning solution, upon the floor of the premises, causing Plaintiff to slip and tall and, in so doing, sustain serious and severe injuries in an amount in excess of the jurisdictional minimum of this Court and in an amount according to proof at time of trial. Further, at that time and place, Defendants and each of them were maintaining the premises in a dangerous and unsafe condition for persons such as Plaintiff, who was foreseeably upon Defendants' premises as a guest and invitee of Defendants and each of them. As a direct and proximate result of the behavior of Defendants and each of them and the condition of the premises, Plaintiff was caused to suffer severe and permanent injuries to her right leg and hip.

Form Approved for Optional Use Judicial Council of California PLD-PI-001(2) [Rev. January 1, 2007]

Case 3:07-cv-03543-JCS Document 1 Filed 07/09/2007 Page 9 of 15
SHORT TITLE: CASE NUMBER:
Stanton v. Target
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION- Premises Liability Page 5
ATTACHMENT TO Complaint Cross-Complaint
(Use a separate cause of action form for each cause of action.)
Prem.L-1. Plaintiff (name): Roberta Stanton alleges the acts of defendants were the legal (proximate) cause of damages to plaintiff. On (date): April 20, 2005 plaintiff was injured on the following premises in the following
fashion (description of premises and circumstances of injury). On or about April 20, 2005, in Redwood City, San Mateo County, Calfiornia, Plaintiff was performing her regular and customary work duties on behalf of her employer and conducting an inventory at a Target Store between 10:00 and 11:00 p.m. on that date. Defendants and each of them at that time negligently, carelessly and recklessly failed to maintain a safe surface on the floor of the store they owned, operated, maintained and controlled. Namely, Defendants and each of them allowed a substance, possibly a cleaning substance, to be spilled upon the floor and otherwise and to remain there during the time that Plaintiff was conducting her tasks with the permission of and cooperation with and at the direction of Target personnel on that evening. Further, Defendants and each of them at that time and on that date maintained a unsafe and dangerous condition upon their property namely the liquid substance upon the floor within an aisle of the Target Store. The conditions as above described caused Plaintiff to fall and to severely injure herself, causing her severe and permanent injuries to include medical expenses, loss of work, loss of earning capacity and other damages according to proof at time of trial.
Prem.L-2. Count One-Negligence The defendants who negligently owned, maintained, managed and operated the described premises were (names): Target Corporation
✓ Does1 to10
Prem.L-3. Count Two-Willful Failure to Warn [Civil Code section 846] The defendant owners who willfully or maliciously failed to guard or warn against a dangerous condition, use, structure, or activity were (names):
Does to an invited guest a paying guest.
Prem.L-4. Count Three-Dangerous Condition of Public Property The defendants who owned public property on which a dangerous condition existed were (names):
a. Does to a. The defendant public entity had actual constructive notice of the existence of the dangerous condition in sufficient time prior to the injury to have corrected it. b The condition was created by employees of the defendant public entity.
Prem.L-5. a. Allegations about Other Defendants The defendants who were the agents and employees of the other defendants and acted within the scope of the agency were (names): Target Corporation
Does 1 to 10 b. The defendants who are liable to plaintiffs for other reasons and the reasons for their liability are described in attachment Prem.L-5.b as follows (names):

CT CORPORATION

A WoltersKluwer Company

Service of Process **Transmittal**

03/23/2007

Log Number 512071326

TO:

REi

FOR:

Carter Leuty

Target Corporation 1000 Nicollet Mall

Minneapolis, MN, 55403-

Process Served in California

Target Corporation (Domestic State: MN)

RECEIVED ON

MAR 2 / 2007

FORWARDED IN AWROM

BJ/554381F

ENCLOSED ARE COPIES OF LEGAL PROCESS RECEIVED BY THE STATUTORY AGENT OF THE ABOVE COMPANY AS FOLLOWS:

TITLE OF ACTION:

Roberta Stanton, Pltf. vs. Target Corporation, et al., Dfts.

DOCUMENT(S) SERVED:

Summons, Complaint, Attachment(s), Stipulation and Order Form, Statement Form,

Notice of Case Management Conference, Request Form

COURT/AGENCY:

San Mateo County, Redwood City, Superior Court, CA Case # CIV461266

NATURE OF ACTION:

Personal Injury - Slip/Trip and Fall - On or about April 20, 2005

ON WHOM PROCESS WAS SERVED:

C T Corporation System, Los Angeles, CA

DATE AND HOUR OF SERVICE:

By Process Server on 03/23/2007 at 15:55

APPEARANCE OR ANSWER DUE:

Within 30 days after service - file written response // July 12, 2007 at 9:00 a.m. - Case Management Conference

ATTORNEY(S) / SENDER(S):

Wayne R. Wolski Law Offices of Wayne R. Wolski

713 Spring Street Santa Rosa, CA, 95404

707-542-4519

ACTION ITEMS:

SOP Papers with Transmittal, via Fed Ex 2 Day, 798136381427

SIGNED: PER ADDRESS:

C T Corporation System Dianne Christman 818 West Seventh Street Los Angeles, CA, 90017 213-337-4615

TELEPHONE:

Received on 3.26.07 at 12.36 pm via Fed Ex forwarded on 3.26.07 at 12.30 pm to Scotywick by Terri Morgan.

Page 1 of 1 / NF

Information displayed on this transmittel is for CT Corporation's record keeping purposes only and is provided to the recipient for quick reference. This information does not constitute a legal opinion as to the nature of action, the amount of damages, the answer date, or any information contained in the documents themselves Recipient is responsible for interpreting said documents and for taking appropriate action. Signatures on certified mail receipts confirm receipt of the package only, not of its contents.



ENDORSED FILED SAN MATEO COUNTY

APR 2 3 2007

Clark of the Superior Court

By M. YOUNG

DEPUTY CLERK

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

ROBER'TA STANTON

Plaintiff,

Case No.: CIV 461266

ANSWER TO UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT

Vs.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TARGET CORPORATION, and DOES 1 to 10, inclusive,

BY FA

Defendants.

Complaint Filed: March 2, 2007

COMES NOW Defendant TARGET STORES, a division of Target Corporation, and for its answer to the unverified complaint of plaintiff ROBERTA STANTON, on file herein, admits, denies and alleges as follows:

Under the provisions of §431.30(d) of the California Code of Civil Procedure, this answering defendant denies each and every, all and singular, generally and specifically, the allegations contained in said complaint and further denies that plaintiff has been damaged in any sum or sums, or at all, by reason of any act or omission on the part of this answering defendant.

AS A FIRST, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT ON FILE HEREIN, AND TO EACH CAUSE OF ACTION THEREOF, this answering defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that neither the complaint nor any of its alleged causes of action states facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against this answering defendant.

-1-

ANSWER TO UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT - Case No. CIV 461266

8

11

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

AS A SECOND, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT ON FILE HEREIN, AND TO EACH CAUSE OF ACTION THEREOF, this answering defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that plaintiff failed to mitigate her alleged damages as required by law.

AS A THIRD, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT ON FILE HEREIN, AND TO EACH CAUSE OF ACTION THEREOF, this answering defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that plaintiff was comparatively at fault in the manner and style as set forth in the case of Li v. Yellow Cab Co. (1975) 13 Cal.3d 804, and defendant prays that any and all damages sustained by said plaintiff be reduced by the percentage of her negligence.

AS A FOURTH, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT ON FILE HEREIN, AND TO EACH CAUSE OF ACTION THEREOF, this answering defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the damages complained of, if any there were, were proximately contributed to or caused by the carelessness, negligence, fault or defects created by the remaining parties in this action, or by other persons, corporations or business entities unknown to this answering defendant at this time, and were not caused in any way by this answering defendant, or by persons for whom this answering defendant is legally liable.

Should this answering defendant be found liable to plaintiff, which liability is expressly denied, said defendant is entitled to have this award against it abated, reduced or eliminated to the extent that the negligence, carelessness, fault or defects created by the remaining parties in this action, or by said other persons, corporations or business entities, contributed to plaintiff's damages, if any.

AS A FIFTH, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT ON FILE HEREIN, AND TO EACH CAUSE OF ACTION THEREOF, this answering defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that plaintiff knew, or in the exercise of ordinary care should have known, of the risks and hazards involved in the undertaking in which she was engaged, but nevertheless and knowing these things, did freely

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24 25

26

27

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

27

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (28 U.S.C. §1746)

I am employed in the County of Alameda, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 555 12th Street, Suite 1800, P. O. Box 12925, Oakland, California 94604-2925.

I am readily familiar with the business practice for collection and processing of

correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. On the date indicated below, at the above-referenced business location, I sealed envelopes, enclosing a copy of the PETITION FOR REMOVAL OF ACTION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §1441(b) [DIVERSITY]; CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET, addressed as shown below, and placed them for collection and mailing following ordinary business practices to be deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below:

Wayne R. Wolski, Esq. Law Offices of Wayne R. Wolski 713 Spring Street Santa Rosa, CA 95404 (707) 542-4519 Phone (707) 542-7139 Fax **Attorneys for Plaintiff**

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at Oakland, California, on July ______, 2007.

Alexine L. Braun

24901\409072

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27